

**RETAIN IN TOM PROJECT FILE**

# TASK ORDER VERIFICATION FORM

CONTRACT NO: EP-W-06-004 PRIME: EA ENGINEERING, SCIENCE, AND TECHNOLOGY,  
INC., PBC T.O.: 0128-RICO-06GG

PROJECT NAME: Wilcox Oil Company RI/FS PRIME PM: Teri McMillan

EPA TOM: Katrina Higgins-Coltrain

REPORTING PERIOD: July 2, 2016 to August 5, 2016 Voucher: 127

## Check One

  X   Sufficient progress has been made by the contractor to support payment for work performed during the month reported.

           Contractor must provide additional cost justification to enable verification of costs on this work assignment.

\_\_\_ Cost listed below should be withheld since they cannot be verified.

\_\_\_\_ Insufficient work has been performed on this assignment to evaluate contractor at this time.

Comments/Explanation:

## MONTHLY CONTRACTOR REVIEW

### Circle One

### QUALITY OF PRODUCT OR SERVICE

**(O) Non-conformance** is jeopardizing the achievement of Task Order requirements, despite use of Agency resources. Recovery is not likely. If not substantially corrected, such performance should constitute a significant impediment in considerations for future awards containing similar requirements.

(1) Overall compliance requires major Agency resources to ensure achievement of Task Order requirements.

(2) Overall compliance requires minor Agency resources to ensure achievement of Task Order requirements.

**(3)** There are no, or very minimal, quality problems, and the Contractor has met the Task Order requirements.

(4) There are no quality problems, and the Contractor has substantially exceeded the Task Order performance requirements without commensurate additional costs to the Government.

(5) The contractor has demonstrated an outstanding performance level that was significantly in excess of anticipated achievements and is commendable as an example for others, so that it justifies adding a point to the score. It is expected that this rating will be used in those rare circumstances where contractor performance clearly exceeds the performance levels described as "Excellent."

0 1 2 **3** 4 5

## COST CONTROL

**(O) Ability to manage cost issues is jeopardizing performance of Task Order requirements, despite use of Agency resources. Recovery is not likely. If not substantially corrected, this level of ability to manage cost issues should constitute a significant impediment in consideration of future awards.**

**(1) Ability to manage cost issues requires major Agency resources to ensure achievement of Task Order requirements.**

(2) Ability to manage cost issues requires minor Agency resources to ensure achievement of Task Order requirements.

(3) There are no, or very minimal, cost management issues and the Contractor has met the Task Order requirements.

(4) There are no cost management issues and the Contractor has exceeded the Task Order requirements, achieving unanticipated cost savings to the Government.

(5) The contractor has demonstrated an outstanding performance level that justifies adding a point to the score. It is expected that this rating will be used in those rare circumstances where contractor performance clearly exceeds the performance level described as “Excellent.”

0 1 2 3 4 5

**TIMELINESS OF PERFORMANCE**

(0) Delays are jeopardizing the achievement of Task Order requirements, despite use of Agency resources. Recovery is not likely. If not substantially corrected, such timeliness should constitute a significant impediment in considerations for future awards containing similar time schedule requirements.  
(1) Delays require major Agency resources to ensure achievement of Task Order requirements.  
(2) Delays require minor Agency resources to ensure achievement of Task Order requirements.  
(3) There are no, or minimal, delays that do not impact achievement of Task Order requirements.  
(4) There are no delays and the contractor has significantly exceeded the agreed upon time schedule.  
(5) The contractor has demonstrated an outstanding performance level that justifies adding a point to the score. It is expected that this rating will be used in those rare circumstances where the contractor performance clearly exceeds the performance levels described as "Excellent."

0 1 2 **3** 4 5**BUSINESS RELATIONS**

(0) Response to inquiries, technical/service/administrative issues is not effective. If not substantially mitigated or corrected it should constitute a significant impediment in considerations for future awards.  
(1) Response to inquiries, technical/service/administrative/ issues is marginally effective.  
(2) Response to inquiries, technical/service/administrative/ issues is somewhat effective.  
(3) Response to inquiries, technical/service/administrative/ issues is consistently effective.  
(4) Response to inquiries, technical/service/administrative/ issues is significantly above the effective level.  
(5) The contractor has demonstrated an outstanding performance level that justifies adding a point to the score. It is expected that this rating will be used in those rare circumstances where contractor performance clearly exceeds the performance levels described as "Excellent."

0 1 2 **3** 4 5

8-19-16

**Task Order Manager Signature****Date**

CHECKLIST FOR INVOICE REVIEW			
Contract No.: EP-W-06-004			
TO No.: 0128-RICO-06GG			
Reporting Period: July 2, 2016 to August 5, 2016			
GENERAL	YES	NO	N/A
1. The site/Project was active during this reporting period.	X		
2. The Contractor is currently at/above the 95% level of approved budget.		X	
3. The activities reported in the Monthly Status Report seem accurate, in accordance with actual progress made, and sufficiently detailed.	X		
LABOR			
4. The LOE charged is proportionate with project progress.	X		
5. The labor mix is appropriate and consistent with project needs.	X		
6. Hours charged by category are within designated limits.	X		
7. Overtime is not allowed at a premium rate, but if overtime at the straight rate was charged, was it approved in advance and necessary to meet project needs?			X
TRAVEL			
8. Travel was in accordance with approved work plan projections.			X
9. Travel was detailed in Status Report (who, when, where, & why) and is consistent with project needs.			X
10. Travel expenses seem justified and reasonable.			X
ODCs			
11. Photocopying/Postage charges seem appropriate for magnitude of deliverables.	X		
12. Communications charges seem justifiable and reasonable to meet project needs. <i>Described as 'computer usage, equipment, reproduction, telephone, supplies, mail/delivery, and other' in the progress report.</i> GIS/CADD	X		
13. If present, the amount of miscellaneous charges seem reasonable and commensurate with the work performed. <i>Field disposables.</i>	X		
SUBCONTRACTOR COSTS (Specialty & Team Subs)			
14. Subcontractor's LOE and charges seem reasonable for TO support provided and consistent with approved work plan.			X
15. Subcontractor's LOE and charges are appropriately detailed and sufficient breakdown of charges by element is supplied.			X

**Comments/action items:**

- Project within budget and LOE.
- Monthly report is consistent with work expected, discussions had, and planning efforts thus far.
- Contractor updates RPM on schedule and progress weekly.
- Contractor is available to discuss site planning: multiple updates and conference calls. Noted in the monthly, but also additional calls by RPM throughout the reporting period.
- The revised draft SAP was submitted for review. Minor revisions needed. Minimal comment received from review team.
- Work plan revision under review. New contractor project manager assigned.
- Contractor geared up quickly to support ERT passive gas field effort.